

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	l	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			C/3	
08/242.960	05/16/9	05/16/94 REID		252.32951X00	
			CDIABES	CRIARES T	
		12M2/0711	ART UNIT		
JEROME J. N			ANIONI	PAPER NORDEN	
ATTORNEY AT		CODVETCUTO		/	
		, COPYRIGHTS N.W. SUITE 1250	1205	•	
WASHINGTON			DATE MAILED:	27/11/25	
This is a communication fr COMMISSIONER OF PAT		charge of your application. EMARKS		07/11/95	
_/					
This application has b		Responsive to communication filed or			
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire Three Caronth(s), days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133					
Part I THE FOLLOWING	ATTACHMENT(S	S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:	•		
. 178			Alasias of Destromento	Patent Denvine Designs PTA 948	
	ences Cited by Ex- ted by Applicant, F			Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. ont Application, PTO-152.	
_		ving Changes, PTO-1474 6.	j		
Part II SUMMARY OF	ACTION				
1. [2] Claims_/-//	<u> </u>			are pending in the application.	
Of the above	e, claims	10 and 11	a	re withdrawn from consideration.	
2. Claims				have been cancelled.	
3. Claims				are allowed.	
4. Claims	1-9			are rejected.	
5. Claims				are objected to.	
6. Claims			are subject to restric	tion or election requirement.	
7. This application h	as been filed with i	nformal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 whi	ch are acceptable for exa	mination purposes.	
8. Formal drawings	are required in resp	oonse to this Office action.			
 The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948). 					
10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on has (have) been approved by the examiner; addisapproved by the examiner (see explanation).					
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).					
12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no; filed on					
13. Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.					
14 Cothor					

20.252

Serial No. 08/242,960

Art Unit 1205

The papers filed May 15, 1995 have been received and entered in the file.

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, Claims 1-9 in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged.

This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Note that Tables III and IV are missing.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as the disclosure is enabling only for claims limited the solvents and polymer to be used in the claimed process since the applicants process in forming secclumin2, lines microspheres is known to agglomerate. See Fong U.S. Patent 4,384,975.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been

Serial No. 08/242,960

Art Unit 1205

obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tice et al. '840. This reference in the abstract and at column 1, line 56 to column 3, line 50 teaches applicants claimed process of combining a polymeric matrix. The difference between applicants claims process and the reference is that the reference teaches encapsulation of an anti-inflammatory, whereas the claims read on use of an antigen.

Art Unit 1205

The skilled artisan would have been motivated to use the reference process to encapsulate the claimed active agent since at column 4, line 62 to the column 5 line 10/the reference teaches a member of diseases which would be encapsulated could warry effective to the reference.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to T. Criares at telephone number (703) 308-4607.

A facsimile center has been established in Group 1200, room 3C10. The hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 8:45 AM to 4:45 PM. The telecopier numbers for accessing the facsimile machine are (703) 308-4556 or 305-3592.

CRIARES:bah July 10, 1995 T.J. CRIARES
Examina
Art unt 1205